

Remarks

Claims 11-19 are pending in the application. All claims stand rejected. By this paper, claim 11 has been amended and new claims 20-26 have been added. Consideration of all claims herein is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,876,156 to Muschelknautz et al. ("Muschelknautz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,059,231 to Neu ("Neu"). By this paper, independent claim 11 is amended to include placing an inlet of an air flow means in communication with a venturi. These claimed limitations are not taught or suggested by the prior art references.


Muschelknautz discloses the use of a propellant gas that is delivered under pressure to a jet tube to generate a gas stream. Column 4, lines 31-41. Accordingly, there is no air flow means with an inlet that is in communication with or coupled to a venturi. Muschelknautz does not disclose any structure for an air flow means. In interpreting claims, the Patent and Trademark Office must take into account "whatever enlightenment by way of definitions or otherwise that may be afforded by the written description contained in applicant's specification." *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In the present application, the air flow means is defined as a rotating mechanical device driven by a motor. Page 4, paragraph 15 and accompanying figures. Thus, an air flow means is a mechanical structure and not a propellant gas. A propellant gas also does not have an inlet to communicate with a venturi.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Independent claim 20 requires an air flow means that generates an air flow towards the air flow means. Muschelknautz does not disclose a mechanical structure that generates an air flow towards itself. Claim 20 further requires that the material pass through the venturi and into the air flow means. The cited references do not teach or suggest that the material passes through the venturi and into the air flow means.

"To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP § 2143.03. As the cited references do not teach or suggest an air flow means and other associated limitations a prima facie case of obviousness does not exist against claims 1 and 20. In view of the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 20 represent patentable subject matter. As the remaining depending claims 2-19 and 21-26 each include the limitations of their respective independent claim, they likewise represent patentable subject matter. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John R. Thompson
Registration No. 40,842

STOEL RIVES LLP
One Utah Center Suite 1100
201 S Main Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-4904
Telephone: (801) 328-3131
Facsimile: (801) 578-6999

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☒ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.